

---

**REMARKS**

The Examiner's comments from the Office Action mailed November 1, 2007 have been carefully considered. Claims 6 and 7 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims 6 and 7 in a later filed continuing application. Claims 1-5 and 8-14 remain pending and claims 15-20 have been newly added. Amendments have been made to claims 1, 4, 5, and 8-14. Support for these changes can be found throughout the specification and figures. No new matter has been added.

Reexamination of claims 1-5 and 8-14, and examination and allowance of claims 15-20 are respectfully requested.

**Amendments to the Specification**

Editorial revisions have been made to the specification to add subject headings and to address formal matters.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2005/0135753 to Eigenmann et al. (hereinafter "Eigenmann"). Claim 6 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby rendering the rejection moot. With respect to claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, and 9, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 recites, in part, plug-in connectors each including an arresting part having a T-shaped attachment configured to be inserted into a first end of a guiding groove and biased by a compression spring in an axial direction to a second end of the guiding groove, wherein the first end of the guiding groove is wider than the second end.

Eigenmann does not disclose or suggest plug-in connectors each including an arresting part having a T-shaped attachment configured to be inserted into a first end of a guiding groove and biased by a compression spring in an axial direction to a second end of the guiding groove. Eigenmann also does not disclose or suggest a guiding groove having a first end that is wider than a second end. Furthermore, no reason is provided in Eigenmann or elsewhere to modify Eigenmann to recite the features of claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Eigenmann does not anticipate claim 1. Claims 2, 4-6, 8, and 9 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, and 9 are respectfully requested. Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection and reserve the right to make additional arguments if necessary.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 3 and 10-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eigenmann. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 3 and 10-14 depend from claim 1 and are allowable over Eigenmann for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Eigenmann would not lead a person skilled in the art to the invention of claims 3 and 10-14. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 3 and 10-14 are respectfully requested. Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection and reserve the right to make additional arguments if necessary.

Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eigenmann in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,932,514 to Anderson et al. (hereinafter "Anderson"). Claim 7 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby rendering the rejection moot. Subject matter from claim 7 has been incorporated into claim 1. To the extent the above rejection applies to amended claim 1, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 is allowable over Eigenmann for at least the reasons discussed above. Anderson does not overcome the shortcomings of Eigenmann. Anderson also does not disclose or suggest plug-in connectors each including an arresting part having a T-shaped attachment configured to be inserted into a first end of a guiding groove and biased by a compression spring in an axial direction to a second end of the guiding groove. Anderson also does not disclose or suggest a guiding groove having a first end that is wider than a second end.

For at least these reasons, Eigenmann would not lead a person having skill in the art to the invention of claim 1, even in view of Anderson. Allowance of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

### **New Claims**

To the extent the above rejections are applicable to new claims 15-18, the rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 15 recites, in part, a first latch arrangement of a first plug-in connector that is configured to remain radially fixed with respect to a first ferrule of the first plug-in connector.

None of the cited references disclose or suggest a first latch arrangement of a first plug-in connector that is configured to remain radially fixed with respect to a first ferrule of the first plug-in connector. Both Eigenmann and Anderson disclose latches which deflect radially inwardly to engage and release a coupling.

For at least these reasons, the cited references do not disclose or suggest claim 15. New claims 16-18 depend from claim 15 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Examination and allowance of claims 15-18 are respectfully requested.


### **Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P. C  
P. O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(612) 332-5300

Date: Feb. 1, 2008

By   
Steven C. Bruess  
Reg. No. 34,130  
SCB/JKS:rlk